

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 274

EA 011 190

AUTHOR Johnson, Richard T.; Carlton, Patrick W.
TITLE Virginia School Board Members and Collective Bargaining: An Assessment of Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 36p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Boards of Education; *Collective Bargaining; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Grievance Procedures; Questionnaires; State Surveys; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Militancy
IDENTIFIERS Virginia

ABSTRACT

Out of 832 Virginia school board members contacted, 460 responded to a questionnaire concerning their attitudes toward collective negotiations and militant teacher activities. The similarities between respondents and the general population were sufficient to support claims of generalizability. Analysis of variance revealed that school board members in Virginia are strongly opposed to teacher collective bargaining. They believe that the current situation is satisfactory for educational personnel and that management is adequate. Most respondents feel that collective bargaining has a negative effect on the balance of power in education and is eroding local control of educational policy and practice. Board members apparently have a low opinion of teacher leaders, believing they are motivated chiefly by self-interest. A majority of board members are contented with the state-mandated grievance procedures. They overwhelmingly perceived all types of teacher militancy as inappropriate. When this survey was compared with a similar survey of Virginia teachers, it was clear that board members' views on personnel relations are quite different from those of teachers. (Author/JM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VIRGINIA SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING:
AN ASSESSMENT OF ATTITUDES



"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Carlton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

Richard T. Johnson
Patrick W. Carlton

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1	Characteristics of the Sample and Analysis of Responses.	1
PART 2	Demographic Data.	5
PART 3	Questionnaire Analysis.	10
PART 4	Mean Scores on the Carlton Collective Action Scale, F Scores and Significance Levels (ANOVA)	19
PART 5	Summary and Conclusions	24
PART 6	Survey Instrument	29

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This study, conducted soon after the invalidation of all collectively bargained agreements by the Supreme Court of Virginia, sought to gather baseline data on the attitudes of Virginia school board members toward collective negotiations and militant teacher activities. Each of the 832 members of the school board population was contacted by mail. Of this number, 460 returns were received, a 55% response. The similarities between the sample and the general population were sufficient to support claims of generalizability.

The study, a follow-up to an October, 1977, study on teacher attitudes toward bargaining, establishes one end of the continuum from positive to negative attitudes. As might be expected, board members are conservative in their views, expressing far less support than members of the professional education community for organized teacher activities.

We hope this study will shed intellectual light (not heat) on the proclivities of school board members toward the emotion-charged issue of collective negotiations. Part I is composed of a summary of demographic data and an encapsulation of the data output, intended for the busy reader who may not choose to read the entire report. Part 2 presents the demographic data in tabular form. In Part 3, the questionnaire is presented in an item by item analysis. Part 4 includes a presentation of mean (average) scale scores, F-values and significance levels derived from the analysis of variance. Part 5 summarizes the report.

Richard T. Johnson
Patrick W. Carlton
November, 1978

PART 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

AND

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

PART 1

Following is a summary of the characteristics of those responding to the survey as presented in Tables I-X.

82% of the respondents were male, 18% female.

95% of the respondents were married, 5% unmarried.

96% of the respondents were over 35 years of age, only 4% being 35 or younger.

62% of the respondents had completed one or more college degrees, while 38% had not.

53% of the respondents were business men or professionals, while 47% indicated other occupations.

63% of the respondents earned over \$20,000 per year, while 37% earned \$20,000 or less. 60% of the respondents had children currently attending the public schools, while 40% did not.

24% of the respondents had served as school board members two years or less, while 21% had served for nine years or more.

56% of the respondents represented rural school divisions, 21% represented suburban divisions, and 23% were from urban divisions.

57% of the respondents represented school divisions employing 100-500 teachers.

Item by Item Analysis of Responses

This section includes a summary of responses to the survey based on a question by question analysis, as presented in Tables XI-XXX.

1. 93% of the respondents opposed the statement that Virginia school board members should have worked in 1977 to elect a governor who favored collective bargaining.

2. 84% of the respondents opposed the statement that the state legislature should enact a law authorizing formal public employer-employee negotiations.
3. 94% of the respondents opposed the statement that school board members should have campaigned for legislators who support collective bargaining for public employees.
4. 88% of the respondents agreed that current procedures for dealing with Virginia's public employees are satisfactory.
5. 93% of the respondents believe that the implementation of good management practices could make collective bargaining unnecessary.
6. 82% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that teachers should be able to withhold their services under certain circumstances.
7. 74% of the respondents rejected the notion that collective negotiations for Virginia educators is inevitable.
8. 97% of the respondents disagreed with the idea that slow-downs, boycotts and mandated arbitration are proper procedures for use by school personnel.
9. 94% of the respondents rejected the notion that teachers can get fair salaries only by resorting to collective bargaining.
10. 93% of the respondents agreed with the position that teachers may not and should not strike.
11. 81% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that collective bargaining is a dignified form of behavior.
12. 72% of the respondents agreed that collective negotiations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a dictatorship by teachers.
13. 59% of the respondents rejected the need for a better state mandated grievance procedure.
14. 86% of the respondents felt that collective negotiations is eroding local control of U. S. education.
15. 56% of the respondents agreed that teacher leaders are power hungry and don't care about teachers.
16. 57% of the respondents agreed that projected changes in the Virginia Supplementary Retirement System will promote teacher militancy.

Analysis of Variance Results

The next set of data summarizes ANOVA results as presented in Tables XXXI-XL. A high score on the Carlton Collective Action Scale indicates favorable attitudes toward collective action.

1. Females scored sufficiently higher than males on the scale to yield a statistically significant difference in response. However, the difference was modest.
2. Younger and older board members scored much the same on the scale.
3. Size of school division did not significantly affect respondent scores.
4. Type of community (rural, suburban, urban) seemed to make no difference in average scores.
5. There was a statistically significant variation in response based on respondent occupation. Business persons were most negatively disposed toward bargaining and government employees were least negative.
6. Marital status did not appreciably affect responses to the scale.
7. There was a statistically significant difference in response based on income level. Those who earned \$15,000 or less scored higher than those who earned over \$15,000.
8. There was no statistically significant difference based on whether respondents currently have children attending the public schools.
9. There was a statistically significant response difference based on education level. Those with less than a high school education were generally more positively disposed toward bargaining than those with college training.
10. There was a statistically significant difference based on years of school board experience. Those with the least experience were most positively inclined toward bargaining, while more experienced respondents became increasingly more negative in viewpoint.

PART 2

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

PART 2

The following tables present personal characteristics of the survey respondents.

TABLE I
Sex

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Female	82	18
Male	373	82
No Data	<u>5</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE II
Age

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Under 35	17	4
35 to 49	211	46
50 and over	227	50
No Data	<u>5</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE III
Number of Teachers Employed in School Division

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Under 100	43	10
100 to 499	262	57
500 to 999	86	19
1000 or over	63	14
Missing	<u>6</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE IV
Community Type

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Rural	252	56
Suburban	95	21
Urban	102	23
Missing	<u>11</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE V
Occupation

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Farmer	60	13
Doctor, lawyer	103	23
Business person	139	30
Houseperson	40	9
Government employee	36	8
Other	78	17
Missing	<u>4</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE VI
Marital Status

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Not married	20	5
Married	406	95
Missing	<u>34</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE VII
Income Level

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Under \$10,000	47	11
\$10,000 to \$15,000	54	13
\$15,001 to \$20,000	53	13
\$20,001 to \$25,000	68	16
Over \$25,000	196	47
Missing	<u>42</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE VIII
Number of Years on School Board

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Up to 1 year	36	8
2	73	16
3	47	10
4	42	9
5	42	9
6	55	12
7	38	8
8	22	5
9 or more	95	21
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE IX
Currently Have Children
Attending Public School

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
No	183	40
Yes	269	60
Missing	<u>8</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE X
Educational Background

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Less than high school	14	3
High school graduate	70	15
Some college	91	20
Bachelors degree	175	39
Masters degree	62	14
Doctorate	42	9
Missing	<u>6</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

PART 3

ITEM BY ITEM ANALYSIS OF
THE CARLTON COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALE

PART 3

In order to secure the broadest possible representation of school board attitudes, a population survey of the 839 Virginia school board members was conducted.¹ Each participant received a copy of the attitude scale, plus one or two follow ups if s/he failed to respond within a reasonable period of time. The final return in the study was 460, or 55% of the population.

Cronbach's Alpha yielded a reliability coefficient of .907. This value is high enough to provide the investigators with grounds for substantial confidence in scale reliability.

The data were subjected to analysis utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) subroutines for a comprehensive look at the data.²

The following tables present the item by item responses of those participating in the study. The categories "strongly agree" and "agree" have been combined as have the "disagree" and "strongly disagree." Percentages are based on those answering each separate item.

¹Appreciation is expressed to Dr. George W. Holmes III for his cooperation relative to mailing list access.

²For an explanation of these subroutines see Nie et. al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1975), second edition, passim.

TABLE XI

1. Virginia school board members should have worked to elect a governor favoring collective bargaining in 1977.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	31	7
Disagree	425	93
Missing	<u>4</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XII

2. The state legislature should enact a law authorizing formal public employer-employee negotiations.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	72	16
Disagree	380	84
Missing	<u>8</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XIII

3. I believe that current procedures for dealing with public employees in Virginia are generally satisfactory.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	395	88
Disagree	55	12
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XIV

4. Virginia school board members should have campaigned for legislators who support collective bargaining for public employees.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	26	6
Disagree	427	94
Missing	<u>7</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XV

5. I believe that the implementation of good management practices by Virginia public employers could make collective bargaining unnecessary.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	418	93
Disagree	30	7
Missing	<u>12</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XVI

6. I would not have voted in 1977 for a gubernatorial candidate who favored collective bargaining for public employees.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	361	80
Disagree	89	20
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XVII

7. Teachers should be able to withhold their services under certain conditions.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	82	18
Disagree	368	82
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XVIII

8. I oppose passage of a state negotiations law for public employees.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	355	79
Disagree	95	21
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XIX

9. I believe collective negotiations for Virginia educators is inevitable.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	115	26
Disagree	333	74
Missing	<u>12</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XX

10. I would not have voted in 1977 for a candidate for state legislature who favors collective bargaining for public employees.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	360	81
Disagree	87	19
Missing	<u>13</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXI

11. I believe that slowdowns, boycotts and mandated arbitration are proper procedures to be used by public school employees.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	15	3
Disagree	439	97
Missing	<u>6</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXII

12. I feel that good teachers can get fair salaries only by resorting to collective bargaining.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	29	6
Disagree	427	94
Missing	<u>4</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXIII

13. I feel the traditional position that teachers may not strike is correct.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	418	93
Disagree	34	7
Missing	<u>8</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXIV

14. I believe collective bargaining is a dignified form of teacher behavior.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	88	19
Disagree	363	81
Missing	<u>9</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXV

15. I think collective negotiations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a dictatorship by teachers.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	324	72
Disagree	124	28
Missing	<u>12</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXVI

16. There is a need for a better state mandated grievance procedure.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	183	41
Disagree	260	59
Missing	<u>17</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXVII

17. I feel that collective negotiations is eroding local control of education in the U.S.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	388	86
Disagree	63	14
Missing	<u>9</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXVIII

18. I believe teacher leaders are power hungry and don't care about teachers.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	244	56
Disagree	193	44
Missing	<u>23</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXIX

19. Teachers should be able to strike in order to enforce their demands.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	33	7
Disagree	421	93
Missing	<u>6</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

TABLE XXX

20. I believe that projected changes in the VSRS will promote teacher militancy in Virginia.

	<u>Absolute Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agree	202	57
Disagree	153	43
Missing	<u>105</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	100.0

PART 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AND MEAN SCORES

ON

CARLTON COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALE

PART 4

The following tables indicate mean (average) respondent scores on the Carlton Collective Action Scale, plus the presence or absence of a statistically significant response pattern among various subsets. A significance level of .01 indicates that a difference of the type indicated would occur by chance alone less than once in a thousand cases. A significance level of .05 indicates that such a pattern would occur five times in one hundred cases by chance alone. Non-significance is indicated by the abbreviation "n.s."

TABLE XXXI
Sex

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Female	79	1.89
Male	372	1.79
Missing	<u>9</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 3.796
Sig. = .05

TABLE XXXII
Age

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Under 35	16	1.92
35 to 49	210	1.81
50 and older	225	1.80
Missing	<u>9</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = .552
Sig. = N.S.

TABLE XXXIII
Size of School Division

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Under 100 teachers	42	1.71
100 to 499	261	1.82
500 to 999	85	1.78
1000 or more	62	1.86
Missing	<u>10</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 1.31

Sig. = N.S.

TABLE XXXIV
Community Type

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Rural	251	1.79
Suburban	94	1.85
Urban	101	1.84
Missing	<u>14</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 1.03

Sig. = N.S.

TABLE XXXV
Occupation

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Farmer	59	1.81
Doctor, lawyer or other professional	102	1.86
Business person	139	1.72
Houseperson	37	1.89
Government employee	36	1.99
Other (specify)	78	1.79
Missing	<u>9</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 2.92

Sig. = .01

TABLE XXXVI
Marital Status

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Not married	20	1.99
Married	403	1.80
Missing	37	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 3.5
Sig. = N.S.

TABLE XXXVII
Income Level

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Under \$10,000	46	1.92
\$10,000 to \$15,000	54	1.94
\$15,001 to \$20,000	53	1.89
\$20,001 to \$25,000	68	1.74
Over \$25,000	195	1.74
Missing	44	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 4.04
Sig. = .01

TABLE XXXVIII
Children Currently Attending Public Schools

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
No	180	1.83
Yes	267	1.79
Missing	13	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = .57
Sig. = N.S.

TABLE XXXIX
Educational Level

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Less than high school diploma	13	2.02
High school diploma	69	1.80
Some college	90	1.79
Bachelors or L1B degree	175	1.76
MA degree	61	1.95
Ph.D., M.D. or other doctorate	41	1.79
Missing	<u>11</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 2.2
Sig. = .05

TABLE XL
Years of School Board Experience

	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Up to 1	35	1.96
2	72	1.85
3	47	1.91
4	42	1.89
5	42	1.79
6	55	1.81
7	37	1.74
8	22	1.69
9 or more	93	1.69
Missing	<u>15</u>	<u>missing</u>
TOTAL	460	1.81

F = 2.33
Sig. = .01

PART 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

PART 5

The data presented in this report, while subject to the limitations which the illusiveness of human opinions imposes upon all such research activities, make it startlingly and unequivocally clear that school board members in Virginia are, at present, strongly (perhaps too weak a term) opposed to the practice of collective bargaining by teachers. They see the personnel situation as being good, or at least satisfactory, management as adequate, and would apparently like to continue with "business as usual."

Most of the respondents oppose the passage of legislation which would allow for collective bargaining and would oppose candidates for state office who favor such activities. It seems almost certain, then, that they support the labor policies of Governor John Dalton, who ran on an anti-bargaining platform, handily defeating his modestly pro-bargaining opponent in the November, 1977, gubernatorial race.

At a philosophical level, most respondents feel that collective bargaining is having a negative effect on the balance of power in education, causing a steady erosion of local control of educational policy and practice. Almost three-fourths of them feel that bargaining could get out of hand and ultimately cause a radical realignment of the power relationship between boards and teachers--a dictatorship "of the teachers, by the teachers, and for the teachers," to misquote Abraham Lincoln.

Board members apparently have quite a low opinion of teacher leaders, indicating their belief that such persons are motivated by less than lofty principles chief among which is a desire for personal advancement in power. Such beliefs will make it difficult for board members and teacher leaders to establish the high levels of trust necessary for effective interorganizational communications and discussions.

A majority of the respondents rejected any need for a better state mandated grievance procedure. They are apparently registering a vote of confidence in the present procedure. This is not unexpected, since the procedure is so constructed as to put management (read board and administration) in an exceptionally strong position. It would be interesting to know what effect, if any, the 1978 State Supreme Court ruling which invalidated the binding arbitration portion of the grievance procedure had on their feelings in this regard.

In responding to items concerning the use of procedures which they perceive as illegitimate pressure tactics, board members overwhelmingly rejected the use by teachers of strikes, slowdowns, boycotts, and mandated arbitration. Thus, all types of teacher militancy are perceived by board members as completely inappropriate.

All in all, Virginia board members have a solidly conservative view of what is right and proper in the area of personnel relations. Their views are at substantial variance with those of teachers as gleaned from a recent study on attitudes of Virginia teachers.¹ It might be hypothesized that the two groups are victims of a massive

¹ Patrick W. Carlton and Richard T. Johnson, The Attitudes of Virginia Educators Toward Collective Negotiations, Strikes and Sanctions (Richmond: Virginia Education Association, 1977), p. 23.

"communications blackout" and that board members don't understand teacher needs and desires. On the other hand, it may be that board members know very well how teachers feel, but view the world from a different perspective, one which embraces fiscal conservatism and a commitment to management's rights. If the latter view is correct, and the authors tend to believe that it is, this study suggests the presence of a classical management-labor split, a "have-have not" model, with boards representing "insiders" who have access to resources (admittedly not their own), while teachers occupy an outside, or "have not" position. Such a situation provides the classic conditions for social confrontation.

In today's "seller's market," the fires of confrontation have been temporarily dampened. However, one can be sure that the fire is only temporarily banked, and that the flames will be rekindled as the next teacher shortage, predicted for the 1980's, arrives. It is suggested that boards should plan now to capitalize on the temporary abatement of organizational pressures by teachers, taking the opportunity to build meaningful channels for open and free organizational communications, up, down and laterally.

There is often a substantial gap between messages sent and meaning received. Researchers have detected substantial filtering and distortion of organizational information in bureaucracies of all kinds. This almost universal phenomenon prevents superiors at all levels from detecting and dealing with employee problems. This degradation of systemic information is such a serious problem that entire books have been devoted to cures and palliatives for the problem. The public schools of Virginia clearly have their share of communicative dysfunctions.

Boards would be well advised to adopt a proactive, as opposed to a reactive, posture, in dealing with local teachers, lest they find themselves presiding over an educational debacle of substantial proportions. The challenge is clearly before them. Hopefully, Virginia school boards have the necessary "chutzpah" to meet it. In the words of the bard, "T'is a consummation devoutly to be wished."²

²William Shakespeare, "Hamlet," Act 3, Scene 1, l. 62.

PART 6

CARLTON COLLECTIVE ACTION SCALE



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

IN NORTHERN VIRGINIA AT DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—400 WEST SERVICE ROAD

April 1978

Dear School Board Member:

The year 1977 was momentous for Virginians. Of particular interest was the State Supreme Court's ruling that collective bargaining for teachers and other public employees is unconstitutional. As you know, the repercussions from this ruling were substantial.

As part of a continuing research interest in this area, I am seeking your help in determining opinions on collective bargaining. Your completion of the other side of this page, which requires less than four minutes to do, will provide comparative data on board member opinions as they relate to this important topic.

Your responses will be held in strictest confidence, with data being reported in a statistical format only. No names will be released.

Thank you for your willingness to assist in what I believe to be a very worthy and important project. Please answer soon.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Patrick W. Carlton".

Patrick W. Carlton
Associate Professor

Please read each of the following statements carefully and answer how you feel about each one. Indicate whether you strongly agree, you agree, you disagree, or you strongly disagree by checking the appropriate space. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Virginia school board members should have worked to elect a governor favoring collective bargaining in 1977.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
2. The state legislature should enact a law authorizing formal public employer-employee negotiations.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
3. I believe that current procedures for dealing with public employees in Virginia are generally satisfactory.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
4. Virginia school board members should have campaigned for legislators who support collective bargaining for public employees.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
5. I believe that the implementation of good management practices by Virginia public employers could make collective bargaining unnecessary.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
6. I would not have voted in 1977 for a gubernatorial candidate who favored collective bargaining for public employees.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
7. Teachers should be able to withhold their services under certain conditions.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
8. I oppose passage of a state negotiations law for public employees.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
9. I believe collective negotiations for Virginia educators is inevitable.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
10. I would not have voted in 1977 for a candidate for state legislature who favors collective bargaining for public employees.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
11. I believe that slowdowns, boycotts, and mandated arbitration are proper procedures to be used by public school employees.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
12. I feel that good teachers can get fair salaries only by resorting to collective bargaining.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
13. I feel the traditional position that teachers may not strike is correct.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
14. I believe collective bargaining is a dignified form of teacher behavior.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
15. I think collective negotiations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a dictatorship by teachers.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree

16. There is a need for a better state mandated grievance procedure.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
17. I feel that collective negotiations is eroding local control of education in the U.S.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
18. I believe teacher leaders are power hungry and don't care about teachers.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
19. Teachers should be able to strike in order to enforce their demands.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree
20. I believe that projected changes in the VSRS will promote teacher militancy in Virginia.
()strongly agree ()agree ()disagree ()strongly disagree

And just a few background questions, please...

Your sex? ()female ()male

And age? ()under 35 ()36 to 49 ()50 or over

Number of teachers employed by your school division?

()under 100 ()100 to 499 ()500 to 999 ()1000 or more

Type of community you live in?

()rural ()suburban ()urban

Type of work you do?

- ()farmer
()doctor, lawyer, or other professional
()business person
()housewife or househusband
()government employee
()other; please specify _____

Your marital status? ()single/unmarried/divorced ()married

Your annual salary?

- ()under \$10,000
()\$10,000 to 15,000
()\$15,001 to 20,000
()\$20,001 to 25,000
()over \$25,000

How many years have you served as a school board member? _____

Do you currently have children attending the public schools?

()no ()yes

What is your educational background?

- ()less than a high school diploma
()high school diploma
()some college
()BA or LLB degree
()MA degree
()PhD, MD, or other doctorate